



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/031,992	01/25/2002	Laurent Frerebeau	T3264-907643	8715
181	7590	10/06/2005	EXAMINER	
MILES & STOCKBRIDGE PC 1751 PINNACLE DRIVE SUITE 500 MCLEAN, VA 22102-3833			HILLERY, NATHAN	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2176	
DATE MAILED: 10/06/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/031,992

Applicant(s)

FREREBEAU ET AL.

Examiner

Nathan Hillery

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 September 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 14-17, 19 and 21-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 14-17, 19 and 21-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: RCE filed on 09/12/05.
2. Claims 14 – 17, 19 and 21 – 28 are pending in the case. Claims 14, 23, 24, 27, and 28 are independent.
3. The rejection of claims 14 – 17, 19 – 25, 27, and 28 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable has been withdrawn as necessitated by amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 14 – 17, 19, 21 – 25, 27, and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dallett (DHTML Localization) [as cited by Applicant].
6. **Regarding independent claim 14**, Dallett teaches that *Microsoft Internet Explorer natively supports right-to-left (RTL) rendering of HTML content. Toggling left-to-right (LTR) and RTL display in the browser is as simple as adding one attribute—DIR—to the HTML element. <HTML DIR=RTL> will cause the entire page to display from right to left. This means that the page is rendered so that the top-right corner is the origin, with the X axis increasing from right to left. A properly constructed page will flow correctly with the DIR attribute set to either RTL or LTR (leaving this attribute off of the element will default to LTR). The lion's share of page reversal is provided to you for free.* (p 2, The DIR Attribute), compare with **detecting a localization tag in the document**,

the **localization tag** controlling one or more of structure, appearance and dynamic behavior of the markup document; retrieving, from the document, **localization information associated with said localization tag**. Dallett teaches that *Because the actual Windows Update site uses an automated preprocessing step to determine the value of conditional variables, you won't be able to see this code if you view the page's source. This is the client-side script equivalent of the actual code used* (p 6, first paragraph), compare with **searching a translation file for a localized value associated with the localization information**. Dallett also teaches that *You could use either of the previous two approaches to change this attribute: dynamically writing the tag using script, or allowing translators to make the change manually. In the latter case, the inline style would have to be moved to a global stylesheet to be readily localizable* (p 7, Bad Borders on the Download Button, second paragraph), compare with **replacing said localization tag in the document with the localized value found in the translation file**. It should be noted that although Dallett does not explicitly teach a **translation file**, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to be well-aware that a client-side script and/or stylesheet as disclosed by Dallett can be interpreted as a **translation file** as claimed.

7. **Regarding dependent claims 15 – 17 and 19**, Dallett teaches that *Microsoft Internet Explorer natively supports right-to-left (RTL) rendering of HTML content. Toggling left-to-right (LTR) and RTL display in the browser is as simple as adding one attribute—DIR—to the HTML element. <HTML DIR=RTL> will cause the entire page to display from right to left. This means that the page is rendered so that the top-right*

Art Unit: 2176

corner is the origin, with the X axis increasing from right to left. A properly constructed page will flow correctly with the DIR attribute set to either RTL or LTR (leaving this attribute off of the element will default to LTR). The lion's share of page reversal is provided to you for free. (p 2, The DIR Attribute), compare with **said localization information includes at least one of a localization attribute, a default localization value, and a value corresponding to an automatic transcription function; identifying a type of the document; detecting said localization tag based on the type of document identified in said identifying step; and recognizing at least one of grammar and syntax used in the document based on the type of document identified in said identifying step; said tag is a markup language tag.**

8. **Regarding dependent claim 21**, Dallett teaches that *Because the actual Windows Update site uses an automated preprocessing step to determine the value of conditional variables, you won't be able to see this code if you view the page's source. This is the client-side script equivalent of the actual code used* (p 6, first paragraph), compare with **creating the translation file to include information which associates said localization information with said localized value.** It should be noted that although Dallett does not explicitly teach a **translation file**, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to be well-aware that a client-side script as disclosed by Dallett can be interpreted as a **translation file** as claimed.

9. **Regarding dependent claim 22**, Dallett teaches that *To provide a single code base that renders correctly in either direction, it's not enough to simply provide alternate*

images for the BiDi versions of the site. You have to include script in the page that dynamically changes the images based on the rendering mode being used. Since the Windows Update site supports only Internet Explorer 4.0 and 5.0, I was able to use a Cascading Style Sheets (CSS) filter on the images on the site to effect this change. The filter, flipH, which is installed with both Internet Explorer 4.0 and 5.0, flips any element horizontally so that it displays as a mirror image. The following is the inline script that will determine the direction of the images (p 5, last paragraph), compare with loading code used to implement said localization tool into the document, said code dynamically generating additional code; and performing said replacing step as said additional code is dynamically generated by said code used to implement said localization tool.

10. **Regarding independent claims 23, 24, 27, and 28**, the claims incorporate substantially similar subject matter as claim 14, and are rejected along the same rationale.

11. **Regarding dependent claim 25**, the claim incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claim 22, and is rejected along the same rationale.

12. Claim 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dallett (DHTML Localization) [as cited by Applicant] as applied to claims 14 – 17, 19 – 25, 27 and 28 above, and further in view of Jeske (US005974443A) [as cited by Applicant].

13. **Regarding dependent claim 26**, Dallett does not explicitly teach CGI. However, Jeske teaches that *the preferred embodiment is to use CGI 111, which is an industry*

Art Unit: 2176

standard method of communicating between a web server and another program.

HTTPd 103 initiates the CGI process (common gateway interface gateway) 104, which is a program component that provides access to the agent platform 105. Note that more than one CGI 104 can be running on the web server 102, with one CGI per concurrent browser request (Column 3, lines 15 – 22), compare with the

localization tool is a CGI component. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the invention of Dallett with that of Jeske because such a combination would allow the users of Dallett the benefit of an *access tool that allows for dynamic information generation for web servers (Column 2, lines 54 – 55).*

Response to Arguments

14. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 14 – 17, 19 and 21 – 28 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nathan Hillery whose telephone number is (571) 272-4091. The examiner can normally be reached on M - F, 10:30 a.m. - 7:00 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather R. Herndon can be reached on (571) 272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2176

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

NH

William L. Bashore
WILLIAM BASHORE
PRIMARY EXAMINER
10/2/05